1/4/69

Dear Paul,

Your letter of 1/1 arrived today. I will answer parts in more detail later today or tomorrow. I have communicated your disagreement on "investigative files" to Moo. I also have news from the Archives indicating my earlier suggestion is correct. I will send copy, but if you hear from Rush, both investigative agencies did get WDSU and WWL film promptly.

Your par (2). This is probably the guy who was at Ruby's, pictures, etc. Boxley interviewed him in Tennessee. In connection with (3), loren Butler, I do think I have the clipping from the paper, of the 9th or 10. Right or wrong, Ricardo Davis told me the late edition of the evening paper had a still picture. That is not the edition of record. I have checked both papers in their morgues. The ex ed told me they did have a still and that it has disappeared.

Your (5), Drennan-Brown-Craddock, that is what I meant. Why does the name Craddock stick in my mind? Is there something else on it? Elsewhere in the FBI reports you will find other reference to the showing of 6 WDSU stills. This is invariably by those agents not most active on the case. I have met Steele. Moo had him come in to see the WDSU footage. He impresses me as not very bright but by intent honest. Moo tested him by trying to lead him and Steele didn't go along. I think he is right. There is too much corroborating everything I have checked of what he has said. On the Mulholland-Coporen -Ferrie report. You are right. It is not classified. I got a copy after O in N.O. and do not know where I filed it.

On (7): I plan to go into that much more when I can return to AGENT OSWALD. What you had not yet received when you wrote this bears very much on that. I have an answer from Carr I'll include in the next.

(8) William Allen Simms III, 813 N. Rampart, CD 14, p. 30. Can you send me and Moo each a copy soon as possible? Or, do I already have it? Sounds familiar, but there is much to suggest an Oswald connection with that Walgreen's. This bears very much on what I've recently picked up, that he was in the picketting business regularly, until he got his press, when he lost interest. The feds hid most of it.

(9) I overlooked the rear notations. Can you please send copy? There is something along this line in today's Arch letter.

(10) Yes, but not in any hurry for it. Send one to Moo also, please.

On your 544 Camp-pamphlet position, something from me crossed it in the mail. But remember the immediate benefit to some of these "misinterpretations, as with the ExSess. While I do not agree with your interpretation, I have already passed it on to Moo and will give it to him in full as soon as possible.

If it hasn't dawned on you, the CD735:376 Fritz report comes close to proving that he deliberately denied Oswald counsel because he did know Abt had said no by 11/23/63. Did I not go into this in WW?

Bowen: my card shows CD 205:467-9. If this does not include that rpt, please ask Hal to send copy.

Many thanks. Very helpful.

Sincerely